

**From:** Douglas Frankenthaler/R3/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 1/12/2012 9:05:01 AM  
**To:** Humane Zia/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Cabot/Dimock 104(e) Follow-up

Humane,

I spoke with Amy Barrette yesterday. Quick rundown of the conversation:

Concerning Q 4:

- Subparts a-d will not be a problem to get to EPA within time frame;
- Subpart e will require additional time and wanted additional clarification (what do we mean by "stimulated" and by "performed activities"-we talked about a few things that it should include, such as cementing and casing work, but there are other open ended activities that she hoped EPA could provide additional clarification on-can we follow-up with our folks to provide a more definite list of types of activities that might be included.

Concerning Q 5:

- Depending on how broadly EPA interpreted it, could be hundreds or more;
- I indicated that she should start by providing the names of all people in Cabot and its contractors, etc. that provided information in preparing the responses, and the people that they gathered the information from, and EPA may ask for additional information as well.

Concerning Qs 1-2:

- Thousands of pages of raw lab data may take a little longer to compile, but all the results and basic QA/QC should be provided in time;
- Cabot is going to send copies of its own QA/QC reports as well (I think that falls under the request)-she seemed eager to send that information to EPA, including the information about sampling of bottled water and an "artesian spring." I indicated send it all.

Certification Language:

- She had a concern about the certification language.
- I indicated that if they are proposing any changes to the certification language, they should send it to EPA first for our review, but that I was not aware of EPA normally agreeing to altering that language.
- I also indicated that a certification should be submitted with each submission.

We left it that she was going to send an email to you and me outlining to which portions of the request Cabot needs more time to respond, and how much additional time, with an indication that responses will continue to be provided on a rolling basis. I said that EPA would review the request and provide a response to it-but as long as EPA was getting the most significant information quickly (w/in the requested period) and the request time extension for other parts seemed reasonable, I thought that we would recommend an okay.

She is also supposed to send Cabot's proposed certification language. The issue seemed to be certifying that one person reviewed each of the thousands of pages of responsive documents.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Doug